

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

REMARKS

Claims 3-19, 22-24 and 26-40 were pending when the Application was last examined. Claims 22, 36 and 39 are being amended. New claims 41-43 are being added. Claims 3-19, 22-24 and 26-42 are now pending, of which, claims 22, 36 and 39 are independent.

I. Examiner Interview

A telephone interview was conducted on November 14, 2007, between the Examiner and the representative of the Applicants. The Applicants appreciate the guidance provided by the Examiner.

II. Rejection based on 35 USC 103(a)

Examiner has rejected claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 16-19, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 34-37, and 38-40 based on a 103(a) rejection as being unpatentable over Julien (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129011) in view of Kubota (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323).

Claims 6, 11, 12, 14 and 27 are rejected as being obvious over Julien in view of Kubota and further in view of Lamburt (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,241). Claim 30 is rejected as being obvious over Julien in view of Kubota and further in view of Othmer (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064317).

Claim 22

Independent claim 22 is amended to recite “An information retrieval system, comprising: a database that stores contact information; an interface to a monitor displaying a document being

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

currently viewed by a user, the user operating a task on the system; a monitoring system monitoring the document via the interface and extracting searchable text elements from the document being currently viewed; and a contact information retrieval system that retrieves contact information from the database based on the searchable text elements and that displays the retrieved contact information without disrupting the user's task and the document displayed on the system.” (Emphasis added.) Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings and, for example, in figure 3 and in paragraphs [0007], [0034] and [0072] of the specification.

Applicants submit that not all elements of claim 22 are taught or suggested by Julien or Kubota.

Julien

First, Julien does not teach or suggest “a document being currently viewed by a user ... a monitoring system monitoring the document ... and extracting searchable text elements from the document being currently viewed” of claim 22. (Emphasis added.)

Julien uses either a URL or a keyword to search for contact information. (See, e.g., Julien figures 3 and 4.) Both situations involve direct entry by the user. In both situations the system prompts the user before receiving the entry. In the embodiments shown in figures 2 and 3, the user inputs the URL, from which the contact information is to be collected, to the system 20 in response to a prompt from the system 20. (Julien, [0031].) In one example, the interface unit creates GUIs in the form of data capture dialog boxes and “the user is required to key in ... the URL address where the collection of the contact information is to take place.” (Julien,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

[0033], emphasis added.) Regarding keywords, again, the system of Julien asks the user for direct input: “the prospector unit 38 prompts the system user for at least one key word based on which the prospector unit 38 formulates to the search engine a search query.” (Julien, [0070], emphasis added, see also [0071].)

Julien does not include a monitoring system that would quietly watch the user without interrupting him and would identify which part of what the user is viewing or inputting is a search string. In short, Applicants were unable to locate a passage in Julien that teaches or suggests “a monitoring system ... extracting searchable text elements from the document being currently viewed” of claim 22. As such, at least this element of claim 22 is not taught or suggested by Julien.

Second, Julien does not teach or suggest a “retrieval system that ... displays the retrieved contact information without disrupting ... the document displayed on the system,” of claim 22.

Julien does not appear to specify a relationship between the input by the user and the output provided to the user. “The output 26 releases an output signal conveying the collected contact information to the workstation 12, for display on a monitor to the system user.” (Julien, [0031], see also [0060].) As such, Julien cannot teach or suggest displaying the “contact information without disrupting ... the document displayed” of claim 22.

Response to Arguments Section of the Office action Regarding Julien

The Office action, in response to the arguments section, states that Julien teaches “identify searchable text elements within the document” in paragraph [0030] and in the abstract of this reference where it is stated that the “processing unit extracts the identified information

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

elements from each source of unstructured digitized data.” (Office action, p. 22.) The Office action concludes that “Julien is extracting the information elements, which examiner interprets as searchable elements.” (Id.) Further, the Office action is citing the “URL in Julien being supplied by a user to access a web page” against the limitation “a document requested by a user” in claim 22 prior to the current amendments. (Id.) The Office action states that “the user has to request or open a document for further operations to be performed.” (Id.) The Office action summarizes its position on the last line of the response to arguments as “The webpage accessed by the URL is the current page and that’s where searchable elements are extracted.” (Office action, p. 23.)

In short, the Office action is citing the entering of the URL by the user in Julien against opening a document and the search and extraction of the information elements from a website by Julien against the identifying or extracting of the searchable text elements.

However, under this reasoning, Julien is going to a website according to a provided URL, and is extracting the search terms from that website to be used to search the same website itself. This logic does not teach: “a database ... a document ... extracting ... elements from the document ... retrieves ... information from the database based on ... elements” of claim 22.

Kubota

Abstract and figure 11 of Kubota are cited for disclosing that a unique character string is extracted from an input document and a similarity search is performed by using the unique character string. (Office action, p. 4.) As previously presented, Kubota also requires the user to input the search term. As indicated by Figure 11 of the Kubota reference, a search prompt is

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

displayed and the user has to input a search term and activate the search by clicking on “Run Search”, “Initialize” or “Erase Results”.

As such, Kubota does not appear to teach or suggest “monitoring the document via the interface and extracting searchable text elements from the document” of claim 22.

Further, as the Office action states “In figure 11, the document 907 is being displayed and similarity search could be clicked to find similar documents.” (Id.) Figure 11 of Kubota shows that “the content of a document with the highest matching factor is caused to be displayed in a window 907, and its title or the like is displayed in a window 905. Also, the title or like of the document currently displayed in the window 907 is highlighted and displayed in a window 909.” (Kubota, col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 3.)

Kubota like Julien appears to have one task that is the search task. However, if the user of Kubota decided to conduct another task, as an inspection of figure 11 of Kubota shows, there is little room left for much else on the screen.

As such, Kubota does not appear to teach or suggest a “retrieval system that ... displays the retrieved contact information without disrupting the user's task and the document displayed on the system,” of claim 22.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable in view of both of the cited references, Julien and Kubota, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 36

As explained above, Julien and Kubota taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest “a current document being viewed ... identify searchable text elements within

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

the current document ... a data output device that notifies a user of contacts ... without disrupting display of said current document” of claim 36.

Applicants submit that claim 36 is patentable in view of both of the cited references, Julien and Kubota, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 39

As explained above, Julien and Kubota taken alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or suggest “monitoring ... a current document displayed on a user monitor; identifying searchable portion on the current document ... displaying the contact information on the monitor ... without disrupting user’s task and the document displayed on the computer” of claim 39.

Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable in view of both of the cited references, Julien and Kubota, whether taken alone or in combination.

Dependent Claims

Lamburt is cited for teaching the “comparing the assigned scores for each match to a threshold score value” and Othmer is cited for teaching the “assigns a partial score.” As such, the cited portions of these references do not appear to cure the deficiency of Julien and Kubota in teaching or suggesting all elements of the independent claims and the independent claims of this Application are believed to remain patentable over all of the cited references.

Claims 23, 24, 26-35 and 43 depend from claim 22. Claims 37, 38 and 42 depend from claim 36. Claims 3-19 and 41 depend from claim 39. These dependent claims are believed to be

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/674,422

patentable in view of the cited references at least for their dependence from a patentable base claim.


Withdrawal of the rejections of all of the pending claims and allowance of all of these claims are requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Bach
Registration No. 37,771

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE

23493

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 19, 2007